



IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Patent Application of:

APPLICANT: Georg Mayer et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/581,207 FILING DATE: 9 November 2006

EXAMINER: Timothy X. Pham ART UNIT: 2617

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 800.0105.U1(US)

TITLE: A Method For Handling Service Failures

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. BOX 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**ARGUMENTS FOR A PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE REQUEST FOR  
REVIEW**

Sir:

This paper includes the arguments accompanying a Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Request for Review and Notice of Appeal. The following is a concise recitation of **clear error** in the Examiner's rejections in this application. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kastelewicz, U.S. Patent Publication no. 2004/0153667. Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art clearly would not interpret Kastelewicz as the Examiner has interpreted Kastelewicz, and even if the Examiner's interpretation is correct, Kastelewicz still does not disclose all elements of the claims.

The Examiner states the following:

detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service (paragraphs [0028]-[0029], [0049], [0052]; e.g., When the token timer runs out (i.e. the predetermined validity period of the token has been exceeded), then the communication terminal UE can no longer be used for any further IMS services; therefore, it is characterized as the serving network element is out of service);

Outstanding Office Action, page 3.

Because the UE can no longer be used for any further IMS services has no relationship with whether a S-CSCF in Kastelewicz is “out of service”. Applicant implicitly defines what is meant by “out of service”. See, e.g., paragraphs 11 and 12 in Applicant’s published application 2007/0275710. The Examiner’s interpretation of what is met by “detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service” is clearly inapposite the Applicant’s definition of a serving network element that is “out of service”. This is true at least because the S-CSCF in Kastelewicz sends SIP 401 UNAUTHORIZED and other messages even when the UE can no longer be used for IMS services. See, e.g., paragraphs 47-55 of Kastelewicz. Therefore the S-CSCF is not “out of service” merely because the UE can no longer be used for any further IMS services.

Additionally, M.P.E.P. §2111 states the following: “The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach”, citing *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999). It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not consider a S-CSCF in Kastelewicz to be “out of service” merely because a UE can no longer be used for IMS services. The S-CSCF is still “in service”, especially since the S-CSCF in Kastelewicz sends SIP 401 UNAUTHORIZED and other messages even when the UE can no longer be used for IMS services. Again, see, e.g., paragraphs 47-55 of Kastelewicz.

For at least these reasons, the §102 rejections against the claims should be withdrawn.

Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that Kastelewicz does not disclose all the features of claim 1. For instance, Kastelewicz does not disclose at least the subject matter of “detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service”, and “in response to detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service and to determining that the type of the first message is a re-registration request, sending from the first network element to the user equipment an error message including an indication that the serving network element is out of service”.

Kastelewicz appears to introduce a safe registration procedure for IMS. The initial registration includes two separate REGISTER messages SIP REGISTER1 and SIP REGISTER2 (messages 5 and 15 in FIG. 2 of Kastelewicz). As a response to the first register message, the S-CSCF (or IMS network) computes a token, which is sent to the terminal in a message called SIP 401 UNAUTHORIZED. Please note that it is said in [0029] of Kastelewicz that “This transport message is used in order to transport the token from the switching center S-CSCF to the terminal UE (arrows 11-13).” Please note also what is said in [0031] of Kastelewicz: “However, this token will subsequently be required for successful registration (sign-in) in the service network IMS.” Thus, the message SIP 401 UNAUTHORIZED seems to be part of a normal successful registration process in Kastelewicz and this message is just used to transmit the token to the terminal.

That is, the SIP 401 UNAUTHORIZED message does not indicate a serving network element is out of service, particularly since this message originates from the serving network element (S-CSCF, the Serving Call Session Control Function; see paragraph [0019] of Kastelewicz). If the S-CSCF is “out of service”, then how does the S-CSCF in Kastelewicz create the 401 SIP UNAUTHORIZED message?

Also, Kastelewicz describes a re-registration process starting in [0047]. The token may correspond to a timer that runs out. That is, there is a validity period associated

with the token in Kastelewicz. See paragraphs 47, 48 from Kastelewicz. Kastelewicz goes on to describe a number of scenarios that might occur. In none of these scenarios is the S-CSCF in Kastelewicz out of service.

Applicant will examine these scenarios and show that at no point is the S-CSCF out of service and if the S-CSCF is “out of service”, the subject matter of independent claim 1 is still not met.

Kastelewicz introduces two conditions under which an existing token whose token timer has not yet expired is normally replaced by a new token. See paragraphs 49-51 of Kastelewicz. It is clear that the S-CSCF is not “out of service” in paragraph 52 of Kastelewicz, as the S-CSCF is sending a message. It is clear that the S-CSCF in Kastelewicz in paragraph 54 is not “out of service” in this section, as the S-CSCF uses a new token and performs the steps described in FIG. 2 of Kastelewicz in order to perform IMS user authorization. It is clear that the S-CSCF in paragraph 54 of Kastelewicz is not “out of service” in this section, as the S-CSCF responds with a SIP 200 OK message to the UE. It is clear that the S-CSCF in paragraph 55 of Kastelewicz is not out of service in this section, as the S-CSCF erases the token and then performs the steps of FIG. 2.

Thus, in all of the disclosed scenarios in Kastelewicz, the S-CSCF takes affirmative steps to respond to a UE or takes other action, and therefore the S-CSCF is not “out of service”, contrary to the Examiner’s interpretation.


Furthermore, independent claim 1 recites “in response to detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service and to determining that the type of the first message is a re-registration request, sending from the first network element to the user equipment an error message including an indication that the serving network element is out of service”. If the Examiner’s argument is correct that the token time has run out and therefore the “serving network element” is “out of service”, then there should be some message sent from a “first network element” in Kastelewicz that includes “an indication that the serving network element is out of service”. The SIP 410


UNAUTHORIZED message appears to contain a token and does not appear to contain "an indication that the serving network element is out of service".

Moreover, the Examiner has not clearly elucidated which element in Kastelewicz is the "first network element" and which is the "serving network element". The Examiner's argument appears to suggest that the S-CSCF is both the "first network element" and the "serving network element". (Certainly the I-CSCF in Kastelewicz does not appear to determine that the token has expired.) But this would mean in order to meet the subject matter of "detecting at the first network element that the serving network element is out of service", the S-CSCF would have to detect that itself is out of service. How would this be possible? Further, claim 1 recites "transmitting the first message from the first network element to a serving network element". If the S-CSCF is both the "first network element" and the "serving network element", then how would the S-CSCF transmit the first message from itself to itself?

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kastelewicz. Because claim 1 is patentable, all other independent and dependent claims are also patentable.

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert J. Mauri  
Reg. No.: 41,180

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date


Customer No.: 10,948

HARRINGTON & SMITH, Attorneys at Law, LLC

4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ



PTO/SB/33 (07-09)

Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Docket Number (Optional)

800.0105.U1(US)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on January 27, 2011Signature Gail ConwayTyped or printed name Gail Conway

Application Number

10/581,207

Filed

November 9, 2006

First Named Inventor

Georg Mayer et al.

Art Unit

2617

Examiner

Timothy X. Pham

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐

applicant/inventor.

☐

assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

☒

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 41,180
☐

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

**Robert Mauri**

Typed or printed name

**(203)925-9400**

Telephone number

**January 27, 2011**

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☐

\*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.